arXiv:1212.6571v1 [math.GR] 28 Dec 2012

Existence of an invariant measure on a hypergroup

Yu. A. Chapovsky

Abstract

We prove existence of an invariant measure on a hypergroup.

1 Introduction

The notion of a hypergroup, more exactly, a DJS-hypergroup has appeared around 1973 in the independent works of C. Dunkl [1], R. Jewett[2], and R. Spector [3]. Structures more general than commutative DJS-hypergroups, called commutative hypercomplex systems, were introduced by Yu. M. Berezansky and S. G. Krein [4, 5] (1950, 1957); for a detailed account of the theory of hypercomplex systems, see [6]. Introduction of the above structures can be considered as a development of the theory of generalized translation operators introduced and studied by J. Delsart [7] (1938), see also B. Levitan [8].

At the present time, the theory of hypergroups is well developed, see, e.g. [9]. However, much of the theory relies on existence of an invariant measure. Its existence has been proved only in particular cases, — for hypergroups that are either compact or discrete [2, 3], or locally compact and commutative [10]. In the case of a general locally compact hypergroup, a left (or right) invariant measure was assumed to exist, although existence of a subinvariant measure has been proved in [10]. In this paper, we prove that a general (locally compact) hypergroup possesses a left (hence, a right) invariant measure.

The paper is organized as follows.

Section 2 introduces some notations used in the paper, recalls the definition of a hypergroup and some well known facts.

Section 3 contains a proof of the main result. The proof is subdivided into several lemmas.

2 Notations and definitions

All undefined topological notions agree with [11]. Let Q be a Hausdorff locally compact topological space. The linear space of complex-valued continuous functions on Q is denoted by $\mathscr{C}$, the subspace of $\mathscr{C}$ of functions approaching zero at infinity is denoted by $\mathscr{C}_0$. The space $\mathscr{C}_0$ is endowed with the norm

$\|f\| = \sup_{t \in Q} |f(t)|$. By $\mathscr{K}$, we denote the linear subspace of $\mathscr{C}_0$ of functions with compact supports. Support of $f \in \mathscr{K}$ is denoted by $S(f)$. The linear subspace of $\mathscr{K}$ of functions with the supports in a compact set K is denoted by $\mathscr{K}(K)$. The set of nonnegative continuous functions with compact supports will be denoted by $\mathscr{K}_+$, and $\mathscr{K}_+^* = \mathscr{K}_+ \setminus \{0\}$; the subset of $\mathscr{K}_+$ (resp., $\mathscr{K}_+^*$) of functions with the supports in a compact set K is denoted by $\mathscr{K}_+(K)$ (resp. $\mathscr{K}_+^*(K)$). For a compact set K, we denote by 1_K a function in $\mathscr{K}_+$ such that $1_K(s) = 1$ for all $s \in K$. By 1_Q, we denote the constant function, $1_Q(s) = 1$ for all $s \in Q$.

A measure is understood as a complex Radon measure [12] on Q. The linear space of complex Radon measures, over the field $\mathbf{C}$ of complex numbers, is denoted by $\mathscr{M}$. For a measure μ, its norm is $\|\mu\| = \sup_{f \in \mathscr{K},\ \|f\| \leq 1} |\mu(f)|$. The subspace of $\mathscr{M}$ of bounded (resp., compactly supported) measures is denoted by $\mathscr{M}_b$ (resp., $\mathscr{M}_c$). The subset of $\mathscr{M}$ of nonnegative (resp., probability) measures is denoted by $\mathscr{M}_+$ (resp., $\mathscr{M}_p$). For a measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_+$, its support is denoted by $S(\mu)$. If $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_+ \cap \mathscr{M}_b$, then $\|\mu\| = \mu(1_Q)$. The Dirac measure at a point $s \in Q$ is denoted by ε_s. The integral of $f \in \mathscr{K}(F)$ with respect to a measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}$ is denoted by $\mu(f) = \langle f, \mu \rangle = \int_F \langle f, \varepsilon_t \rangle \, d\mu(t) = \int_F f(t) \, d\mu(t)$.

The system of all compact neighborhoods of a point $s \in Q$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{K}_s$.

A hypergroup is undersood in the sense of R. Spector [3], i.e., it is a locally compact topological space Q such that $\mathscr{M}_b$ is endowed with the structure of a Banach algebra. The multiplication, called composition and denoted by $*$, is subject to the following conditions:

(H_1) $\mathscr{M}_p * \mathscr{M}_p \subset \mathscr{M}_p$;

(H_2) the convolution $\mathscr{M}_p \times \mathscr{M}_p \ni (\mu_1, \mu_2) \mapsto \mu_1 * \mu_2 \in \mathscr{M}_p$ is separably continuous with respect to the weak topology $\sigma(\mathscr{M}_b, \mathscr{C}_0)$ on $\mathscr{M}_b$;

(H_3) the map $Q \times Q \ni (s, t) \mapsto \varepsilon_s * \varepsilon_t \in \mathscr{M}_b$ is continuous with respect to the weak topology $\sigma(\mathscr{M}_b, \mathscr{C}_0)$ on $\mathscr{M}_b$;

(H_4) there is a point $e \in Q$, which is necessarily unique, such that $\varepsilon_e * \mu = \mu * \varepsilon_e$ for all $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_b$;

(H_5) there is an involutive homeomorphism $Q \ni t \mapsto \check{t} \in Q$ such that its continuation to $\mathscr{M}_b$ satisfies $(\mu_1 * \mu_2)\check{} = \check{\mu}_2 * \check{\mu}_1$; in particular, $\check{e} = e$;

(H_6) for two points $t, s \in Q$, the condition $t = s$ is equivalent to the condition $e \in S(\varepsilon_t * \check{\varepsilon}_s)$;

(H_7) for every compact subset K of Q and any neighborhood V of K there is a neighborhood U of e such that

1) if $S(\mu) \subset K$ and $S(\nu) \subset U$, then $S(\mu * \nu) \subset V$ and $S(\nu * \mu) \subset V$;
2) if $S(\mu) \subset K$ and $S(\nu) \subset Q \setminus V$, then the sets $S(\mu * \check{\nu})$, $S(\check{\nu} * \mu)$, $S(\check{\mu} * \nu)$, $S(\nu * \check{\mu})$ are disjoint with U.

For $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_b$ and $f \in \mathscr{K}$, the convolutions $\mu * f$ and $f * \mu$ are defined by

$$(\mu * f)(t) = \langle\, f, \check{\mu} * \varepsilon_t \,\rangle, \qquad (f * \mu)(t) = \langle\, f, \varepsilon_t * \check{\mu} \,\rangle. \tag{1}$$

We have [3, Theorems 1.3.2, 1.3.3] that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\, \mu * f, \sigma \,\rangle &= \langle\, f, \check{\mu} * \sigma \,\rangle, &\qquad \langle\, f * \mu, \sigma \,\rangle &= \langle\, f, \sigma * \check{\mu} \,\rangle, \\ (\mu * \nu) * f &= \mu * (\nu * f), &\qquad f * (\mu * \nu) &= (f * \mu) * \nu \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

for $f \in \mathscr{K}$ and $\mu, \nu, \sigma \in \mathscr{M}_b$.

For subsets A and B of Q, we use the notations $A \cdot B = \overline{\bigcup_{a \in A,\, b \in B} S(\epsilon_a * \epsilon_b)}$; we write aB for $\{a\} \cdot B$.

For $\mu, \nu \in \mathscr{M}_+ \cap \mathscr{M}_b$, we have [10, Theorem I-2] that $S(\mu * \nu) = S(\mu) \cdot S(\nu)$. For $f \in \mathscr{K}_+$ and $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_+ \cap \mathscr{M}_b$, [10, Theorem I.8] gives $S(\mu * f) = S(\mu) \cdot S(f)$ and $S(f * \mu) = S(f) \cdot S(\mu)$.

For a measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}$ and $g \in \mathscr{C}$, the measure $h\mu$ is defined by $\langle\, f, h\mu \,\rangle = \langle\, fh, \mu \,\rangle$ for $f \in \mathscr{K}$; it is clear that $h\mu \in \mathscr{M}_c$ for $h \in \mathscr{K}$.

Definition. A positive Radon measure χ on a hypergroup Q is called *left invariant*

$$\langle\, \varepsilon_s * f, \chi \,\rangle = \langle\, f, \chi \,\rangle \tag{3}$$

for all $f \in \mathscr{K}$ and $s \in Q$.

3 Main results

Lemma 1. *For $f \in \mathscr{K}$, define $\check{f}(s) = f(\check{s})$. Then, for $\mu, \nu \in \mathscr{M}_b$, and $f \in \mathscr{K}$, we have the following:*

$$\begin{gathered} (\mu * f)\check{\ } = \check{f} * \check{\mu}, \qquad (f * \mu)\check{\ } = \check{\mu} * \check{f}, \\ \langle\, \mu * f, \nu \,\rangle = \langle\, \nu * \check{f}, \mu \,\rangle. \end{gathered} \tag{4}$$

Proof. Since $\check{f}(s) = f(\check{s}) = \langle\, f, \check{\varepsilon}_s \,\rangle$, using (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu * f)\check{\ }(s) &= \langle\, \mu * f, \check{\varepsilon}_s \,\rangle = \langle\, f, \check{\mu} * \check{\varepsilon}_s \,\rangle = \langle\, f, (\varepsilon_s * \mu)\check{\ } \rangle = \langle\, \check{f}, \varepsilon_s * \mu \,\rangle \\ &= \langle\, \check{f} * \check{\mu}, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

thus the first identity in (4) follows. The second one is proved similarly. The third one is obtained as follows:

$$\langle\, \mu * f, \nu \,\rangle = \langle\, (\mu * f)\check{\ }, \check{\nu} \,\rangle = \langle\, \check{f} * \check{\mu}, \check{\nu} \,\rangle = \langle\, \check{f}, \check{\nu} * \mu \,\rangle = \langle\, \nu * \check{f}, \mu \,\rangle.$$

□

Lemma 2. *Let $\mu_0 \in \mathscr{M}_b$ be an arbitrary bounded positive Radon measure such that $S(\mu_0) = Q$. For $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ and a function $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$, define*

$$\tilde{\chi}_g = \frac{1}{\mu_0 * g}\mu_0. \tag{5}$$

Then $\tilde{\chi}_g$ is a Radon measure, $S(\tilde{\chi}_g) = Q$. Moreover, for any $f \in \mathscr{K}_+$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $U_f \in \mathcal{K}_e$ such that, for any $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_f)$,

$$\|f - (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g\| < \epsilon. \tag{6}$$

Proof. It follows from [10, Theorem I.5] that $\mu_0 * g \in \mathscr{C}$ and is bounded. It is easy to see that $(\mu_0 * g)(t) > 0$ for all $t \in Q$. Thus, $\tilde{\chi}_g$ is a Radon measure. It is evident that $S(\tilde{\chi}_g) = S(\mu_0) = Q$.

Now, let us prove (6). First of all note that $S(f\tilde{\chi}_g) = S(f)$ is compact. Let us fix a compact neighborhood V of the compact set $S(f)$. By axiom (H_7) there is a compact neighborhood U_0 of e such that $S(f) \cdot U_0 \subset V$. Hence, for any $U \subset U_0$ and $F \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$, we have $S(f) \subset S((f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g) \subset V$.

Let now $s \in Q$ and consider

$$\big|f(s) - \big((f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g\big)(s)\big|. \tag{7}$$

If $s \notin V$, then the expression in (7) is zero. Thus, let $s \in V$. Using identities (1) and (4) we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|f(s) - \big((f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g\big)(s)\big| &= \big|\langle\, f - (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle\big| \\
&= \big|\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \langle\, (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle\big| \\
&= \Big|\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle} - \langle\, \big(\frac{f}{\mu_0 * g}\mu_0\big) * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle\Big| \\
&= \Big|\langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \mu_0 \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle} - \langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \frac{f}{\mu_0 * g}\mu_0 \,\rangle\Big| \\
&= \frac{1}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}\Big|\Big\langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle\mu_0 - \frac{f\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\mu_0 * g}\mu_0 \,\Big\rangle\Big| \\
&= \frac{1}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}\Big|\Big\langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \Big(\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \frac{f\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\mu_0 * g}\Big)\mu_0 \,\Big\rangle\Big| \\
&= \frac{1}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}\Big|\int_{S(\varepsilon_s * \check{g})} \langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \\
&\qquad \times \Big(\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \langle\, f, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle}\Big)\, d\mu_0(t)\Big| \\
&\le \frac{1}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle} \int_{S(\varepsilon_s * \check{g})} \langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \, d\mu_0(t) \\
&\qquad \times \sup_{t \in S(\varepsilon_s * \check{g})} \Big|\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \langle\, f, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle}\Big| \\
&= \frac{1}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle} \langle\, \varepsilon_s * \check{g}, \mu_0 \,\rangle \\
&\qquad \times \sup_{t \in S(\varepsilon_s * \check{g})} \Big|\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \langle\, f, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle}\Big| \\
&= \sup_{t \in S(\varepsilon_s * \check{g})} \Big|\langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \langle\, f, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle}\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $D = V \times (V \cdot \check{U}_0)$, and consider the function $\psi\colon D \to \mathbf{R}$ defined by

$$\psi(s,t) = \langle\, f, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_t \,\rangle}. \tag{8}$$

It is continuous and its domain D is compact. Let us show that for a given $\epsilon > 0$ there is $U_f \in \mathcal{K}_e$, $U_f \subset U_0$, such that the variation of the function ψ on $s\check{U}_f \times t\check{U}_f$ will be less than ϵ,

$$\operatorname{Var}_{s\check{U}_f \times t\check{U}_f} \psi = \sup_{(s_1,t_1),(s_2,t_2) \in s\check{U}_f \times t\check{U}_f} |\psi(s_1,t_1) - \psi(s_2,t_2)| < \epsilon, \tag{9}$$

for all $(t,s) \in D$.

Indeed, if this were not the case, then there would exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for each $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ there would be a point $(s_U, t_U) \in D$ with $\operatorname{Var}_{s_U\check{U} \times t_U\check{U}} \psi \geq \epsilon_0$. Consider the net $\big((s_U, t_U)\big)_{U \in \mathcal{K}_e}$ in the compact space D, and let $\big((s_\gamma, t_\gamma)\big)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ be a convergent subnet, that is, $\lim_\gamma (s_\gamma, t_\gamma) = (s^*, t^*) \in D$.

Since ψ is continuous in the point (s^*, t^*) there are open neighborhoods W_{s^*} of the point s^* and W_{t^*} of the point t^* such that

$$\operatorname{Var}_{W_{s^*} \times W_{t^*}} \psi < \epsilon_0. \tag{10}$$

Choose $F_{s^*} \in \mathcal{K}_{s^*}$, $F_{s^*} \subset W_{s^*}$, and $F_{t^*} \in \mathcal{K}_{t^*}$, $F_{t^*} \subset W_{t^*}$, and using (H_7) we let $U_1 \in \mathcal{K}_e$, $U_1 \subset U_0$, be such that $F_{s^*} \cdot \check{U}_1 \subset W_{s^*}$ and $F_{t^*} \cdot \check{U}_1 \subset W_{t^*}$.

Since $\lim_\gamma (s_\gamma, t_\gamma) = (s^*, t^*)$, there is $\gamma^0 \in \Gamma$ such that $(s_\gamma, t_\gamma) \in F_{s^*} \times F_{t^*}$ for all $\gamma \geq \gamma^0$. Choose $\gamma \geq \gamma^0$ such that $U_\gamma \subset U_1$. But then, by the construction of (s_γ, t_γ), we have that $\operatorname{Var}_{s_\gamma\check{U}_\gamma \times t_\gamma\check{U}_\gamma} \psi \geq \epsilon_0$, which is a contradiction to (10), since

$$s_\gamma \check{U}_\gamma \times t_\gamma \check{U}_\gamma \subset (F_{s^*} \cdot \check{U}_1) \times (F_{t^*} \cdot \check{U}_1) \subset W_{s^*} \times W_{t^*}.$$

Hence (10) holds for all $(s,t) \in D$.

Setting $U_f = U_\gamma$ and using the obtained estimate (9) and definition (8) of ψ we get that

$$\sup_{(s_1,t_1),(s_2,t_2) \in s\check{U}_f \times t\check{U}_f} \left| \langle\, f, \varepsilon_{t_1} \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_{s_1} \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_{t_1} \,\rangle} - \langle\, f, \varepsilon_{t_2} \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_{s_2} \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_{t_2} \,\rangle} \right| < \epsilon$$

for all $(s,t) \in D$. Letting $t_1 = t = s = s_1 = s_2$ we have

$$\sup_{t_2 \in s\check{U}_f} \left| \langle\, f, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle - \langle\, f, \varepsilon_{t_2} \,\rangle \frac{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_s \,\rangle}{\langle\, \mu_0 * g, \varepsilon_{t_2} \,\rangle} \right| < \epsilon,$$

and observing that $S(\varepsilon_s * \check{g}) \subset s\check{U}_f$ we obtain the needed estimate (6). ☐

Lemma 3. *Let* $f \in \mathscr{K}_+^*$ *and* $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_c$ *be nonnegative. Then for any* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists* $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ *such that*

$$(1-\epsilon)\|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f) < \langle\, f, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle < (1+\epsilon)\|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f), \tag{11}$$

for arbitrary $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$ *satisfying* $\check{g} = g$.

Proof. Fix $U_0 \in \mathcal{K}_e$. For $\epsilon_1 > 0$, let $U_1 \in \mathcal{K}_e$, $U_1 \subset U_0$, be such that (6) holds for any $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_1)$. Since $S((f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g) = S(f) \cdot S(g) \subset S(f) \cdot U_0$, setting $K = S(f) \cdot U_0$ and using (6) gives that

$$(f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g - \epsilon_1 1_K < f < (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g + \epsilon_1 1_K.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\, (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle - \epsilon_1 \langle\, 1_K, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle < \langle\, f, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad < \langle\, (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle + \epsilon_1 \langle\, 1_K, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Consider the first term in the left- and right-hand sides of (12),

$$\langle\, (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle = \langle\, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle.$$

Denote $L_1 = S(\check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g) = S(\check{\mu}) \cdot S(f) \cdot S(g)$, which is a compact set. Then

$$\langle\, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle = \langle\, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, 1_{L_1}\tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle = \langle\, (1_{L_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) * \check{g}, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle. \tag{13}$$

Let $\epsilon_2 > 0$ be arbitrary. Let $U_2 \in \mathcal{K}_e$, $U_2 \subset U_0$, be such that

$$\|1_{L_1} - (1_{L_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) * g\| < \epsilon_2$$

for any $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_2)$. If $L_2 = S((1_{L_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) * g) = S(1_{L_1}) \cdot S(g)$, then it follows from the last estimate that

$$1_{L_1} - \epsilon_2 1_{L_2} < (1_{L_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) * g < 1_{L_1} + \epsilon_2 1_{L_2}.$$

Thus using that $\check{g} = g$ and the last inequality we get

$$\langle\, 1_{L_1} - \epsilon_2 1_{L_2}, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle < \langle\, (1_{L_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) * \check{g}, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle < \langle\, 1_{L_1} + \epsilon_2 1_{L_2}, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle. \tag{14}$$

Since $S(\check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g)) = S(\check{\mu}) \cdot S(f) \subset L_1 \subset L_2$, we have

$$\langle\, 1_{L_1}, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle = \langle\, 1_Q, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle = \check{\mu}(1_Q)\tilde{\chi}_g(f) = \|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f).$$

In the same way,

$$\langle\, 1_{L_2}, \check{\mu} * (f\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle = \|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f).$$

Hence, using the obtained values in inequalities (14) we get from (13) an estimate for the first term in (12),

$$(1 - \epsilon_2)\, \|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f) < \langle\, (f\tilde{\chi}_g) * g, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle < (1 + \epsilon_2)\, \|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f). \tag{15}$$

Consider now the second term in (12),

$$\epsilon_1 \langle\, 1_K, \mu * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle = \epsilon_1 \langle\, \check{\mu} * 1_K, \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle.$$

If $K_1 = S(\check{\mu} * 1_K)$, which is compact, then

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 \langle\, \check{\mu} * 1_K, \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle &= \epsilon_1 \langle\, \check{\mu} * 1_K, 1_{K_1}\tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle = \epsilon_1 \langle\, 1_K, \mu * (1_{K_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle \\ &< \epsilon_1 \langle\, 1, \mu * (1_{K_1}\tilde{\chi}_g) \,\rangle = \epsilon_1 \mu(1)\, \tilde{\chi}_g(1_{K_1}) \\ &= \epsilon_1 \|\mu\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(1_{K_1}). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

If we took $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\tilde{\chi}_g(f)}{2\tilde{\mu}(1_{K_1})}\epsilon$, $\epsilon_2 = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$, $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$, where $U = U_1 \cap U_2$, using (15) and (16) in (12) we would arrive at (11). □

Lemma 4. *Let $f_0 \in \mathscr{K}_+^*$ be fixed. For $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ and $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$ satisfying $\check{g} = g$, define*

$$\chi_g = \frac{\tilde{\chi}_g}{\tilde{\chi}_g(f_0)}, \tag{17}$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_g$ is defined in (5). Then for any $f \in \mathscr{K}_+^*$ there exist positive $a_f, b_f \in \mathbf{R}$ and $U_f \in \mathcal{K}_e$ such that

$$a_f < \chi_g(f) < b_f \tag{18}$$

for any $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_f)$, $\check{g} = g$.

Proof. For functions $f_0, f \in \mathscr{K}_+$, it follows from [10, III (p. 159)] that there exist positive measures $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathscr{M}_c$ such that

$$f < \mu_1 * f_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad f_0 < \mu_2 * f.$$

Then, fixing $\epsilon = 1$ and letting $U_1 \in \mathcal{K}_e$ be such that (11) holds for f_0, μ_1, and arbitrary $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_1)$, we find that

$$\tilde{\chi}_g(f) < \langle\, \mu_1 * f_0, \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle = \langle\, f_0, \check{\mu}_1 * \tilde{\chi}_g \,\rangle < 2\|\mu_1\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f_0),$$

or

$$\chi_g(f) = \frac{\tilde{\chi}_g(f)}{\tilde{\chi}_g(f_0)} < 2\|\mu_1\|.$$

If now $U_2 \in \mathcal{K}_e$ is such that (11) holds for f, μ_2, and arbitrary $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_2)$, then we similarly get that

$$\tilde{\chi}_g(f_0) < 2\|\mu_2\|\, \tilde{\chi}_g(f),$$

or

$$\chi_g(f) = \frac{\tilde{\chi}_g(f)}{\tilde{\chi}_g(f_0)} > \frac{1}{2\|\mu_2\|}.$$

Hence, we can take $a_f = \frac{1}{2\|\mu_2\|}$, $b_f = 2\|\mu_1\|$, and $U_f = U_1 \cap U_2$. □

Lemma 5. *For each $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$, choose $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$ satisfying $\check{g} = g$. Then the net $(\chi_g)_{U \in \mathcal{K}_e}$ is $\sigma(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{K})$-convergent, that is, the limit $\lim_U \chi_g(f)$ exists for any $f \in \mathscr{K}$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that the net $(\chi_g(f))_{U \in \mathcal{K}_e}$ is Cauchy for $f \in \mathscr{K}_+^*$.

First of all, it follows from (17) that $\chi_{kg} = \chi_g$ for any real $k > 0$. So we can assume that all considered g are normalized so that $\tilde{\chi}_g(f_0) = 1$, hence $\tilde{\chi}_g = \chi_g$.

Now, let $V \in \mathcal{K}_e$ be fixed, and let ϵ, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, be arbitrary.

Let $U_0 \in \mathcal{K}_e$, $U_0 \subset V$, be such that (6) holds for the functions f, f_0 and the measure χ_{g_0}, as well as $\chi_{g_0}(f)$ satisfies estimate (18), for any $g_0 \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_0)$. Then

$$(f\chi_{g_0}) * g_0 - \epsilon 1_K < f < (f\chi_{g_0}) * g_{U_0} + \epsilon 1_K, \tag{19}$$

$$(f_0\chi_{g_0}) * g_0 - \epsilon 1_K < f_0 < (f_0\chi_{g_0}) * g_0 + \epsilon 1_K, \tag{20}$$

where we set $K = \big(S(f) \cup S(f_0)\big) \cdot V$. Considering (19) we get that

$$\langle\, (f\chi_{g_0}) * g_0, \chi_g \,\rangle - \epsilon\chi_g(1_K) < \chi_g(f) < \langle\, (f\chi_{g_0}) * g_0, \chi_g \,\rangle + \epsilon\chi_g(1_K) \tag{21}$$

for any $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ and $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$. Now, consider

$$\langle\, (f\chi_{g_0}) * g_0, \chi_g \,\rangle = \langle\, g_0, (f\chi_{g_0})\check{} * \chi_g \,\rangle,$$

and let $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ be such that the measure χ_g, $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$, would satisfy (11) for the function g_0 and the measure $(f\chi_{g_0})\check{}$. Then we have

$$(1-\epsilon)\chi_{g_0}(f)\chi_g(g_0) < \langle\, (f\chi_{g_0}) * g_0, \chi_g \,\rangle < (1+\epsilon)\chi_{g_0}(f)\chi_g(g_0),$$

which, together with (21), gives

$$(1-\epsilon)\chi_{g_0}(f)\chi_g(g_0) - \epsilon\chi_g(1_K) < \chi_g(f) < (1+\epsilon)\chi_{g_0}(f)\chi_g(g_0) + \epsilon\chi_g(1_K). \tag{22}$$

Assuming that U was chosen such that the measure χ_g satisfies (11) also for the function g_0 and the measure $(f_0\chi_{g_0})\check{}$, we get similar estimates for $\chi_g(f_0)$,

$$(1-\epsilon)\chi_{g_0}(f_0)\chi_g(g_0) - \epsilon\chi_g(1_K) < \chi_g(f_0) < (1+\epsilon)\chi_{g_0}(f_0)\chi_g(g_0) + \epsilon\chi_g(1_K). \tag{23}$$

Since g is normalized so that $\chi_g(f_0) = 1$, these inequalities yield the estimate

$$\frac{1 - \epsilon\chi_g(1_K)}{1+\epsilon} < \chi_g(g_0) < \frac{1 + \epsilon\chi_g(1_K)}{1-\epsilon}.$$

If we apply this estimate to (22) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\big(1 - \epsilon\chi_g(1_K)\big)\chi_{g_0}(f) - \epsilon\chi_g(1_K) &< \chi_g(f) \\ &< \frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\big(1 + \epsilon\chi_g(1_K)\big)\chi_{g_0}(f) + \epsilon\chi_g(1_K). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, assuming that U was chosen so that $\chi_g(1_K)$ satisfies estimate (18), we get

$$\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}(1 - \epsilon b_{1_K})\chi_{g_0}(f) - \epsilon b_{1_K} < \chi_g(f) < \frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}(1 + \epsilon b_{1_K})\chi_{g_0}(f) + \epsilon b_{1_K}. \tag{24}$$

This implies that for any $U_1 \subset U$, $U_2 \subset U$, and $g_1 \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_1)$, $g_2 \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U_2)$,

$$|\chi_{g_1}(f) - \chi_{g_2}(f)| < \frac{2\epsilon}{1-\epsilon^2}\big((1 + (1+\epsilon^2)b_{1_K}\big)\chi_{g_0}(f) + 2\epsilon b_{1_K}. \tag{25}$$

Since U_0 was chosen so that $\chi_{g_0}(f) < b_f$, it follows from (25) that $\big(\chi_g(f)\big)_{U\in\mathcal{K}_e}$ is a Cauchy net. □

Theorem. *On any (locally compact) hypergroup Q there exists a left invariant measure χ with $S(\chi) = Q$.*

Proof. For any $f \in \mathscr{K}_+^*$, set $\chi(f) = \lim_U \chi_g(f)$ as in Lemma 5, and extend it by linearity to a linear functional on $\mathscr{K}$.

Let K be a compact subset of Q and $f_1, f_2 \in \mathscr{K}(K)$. Then, for any $U \in \mathcal{K}_e$ and $g \in \mathscr{K}_+^*(U)$, we have

$$|\chi_g(f_1) - \chi_g(f_2)| = |\chi_g(f_1 - f_2)| = |\chi_g(1_K(f_1 - f_2))| \le \chi_g(1_K)\|f_1 - f_2\|.$$

This shows that, eventually,

$$|\chi_g(f_1) - \chi_g(f_2)| \le b_{1_K}\|f_1 - f_2\|,$$

hence χ is a bounded linear functional on $\mathscr{K}(K)$ for arbitrary compact K, and thus a Radon measure.

By setting $\mu = \check{\varepsilon}_s$ in inequality (11) for $\tilde{\chi}_g$, dividing it by $\tilde{\chi}_g(f_0)$ and using that $\|\check{\varepsilon}_s\| = 1$, we get

$$(1 - \epsilon)\chi_g(f) < \langle f, \check{\varepsilon}_s * \chi_g \rangle = \langle \varepsilon_s * f, \chi_g \rangle < (1 + \epsilon)\chi_g(f).$$

Since this eventually holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, we see that χ satisfies (3), hence it is a left invariant measure. It is clear that $S(\chi) = Q$, since, for any $f \in \mathscr{K}_+^*$, we eventually have $\chi_g(f) > a_f > 0$ by Lemma 4. ☐

Acknowledgments. The author is very grateful to A. A. Kalyuzhnyi and G. B. Podkolzin for numerous and fruitful discussions of the subject of the article.

References

[1] C. F. Dunkl. Structure hypergroups for measure algebras. *Pacific J. Math*, 47:413–425, 1973.

[2] R. I. Jewett. Spaces with an abstract convolution of measures. *Adv. in Math.*, 18(1):1–101, 1975.

[3] R. Spector. Aperçu de la théorie des hypergroups. *Lect. Notes in Math*, 497:643–673, 1975.

[4] Yu. M. Berezansky and S. G. Krein. Continual algebras. *Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR*, 72(1):5–8, 1950.

[5] Yu. M. Berezansky and S. G. Krein. Hypercomplex systems with continual basis. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 12(1):147–152, 1957.

[6] Yu. M. Berezansky and A. A. Kalyuzhnyi. *Harmonic Analysis in Hypercomplex Systems.* Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1992. Engl. Transl. Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1998.

[7] J. Delsart. Sur une extension de la formule de Taylor. *J. Math. Pure et Appl.*, 17(3):213–231, 1938.

[8] B. M. Levitan. *A theory of generalized translation operators.* Nauka, 1973. (in Russian).

[9] W. Bloom and H. Heyer. *Harmonic Analysis of probability measures on hypergroups.* de Gruyer, Berlin, New York, 1991.

[10] R. Spector. Mesures invariantes sur les hypergroups. *Trans. AMS*, 239:147–165, 1978.

[11] J. L. Kelley. *General topology.* Number 27 in Graduate texts in mathematics. Springer–Verlag, New-York, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1975.

[12] N. Bourbaki. *Integration*, volume I. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.